

also a full apparatus of the indirect tradition for the text, with constant references e.g. to the *Christus Patiens*, and an appendix giving the tradition for the missing part of the tragedy containing the reconstruction of Pentheus' body. The apparatus criticus is divided in two parts, the apparatus proper giving only the necessary information for the text adopted, more information about other conjectures being given in an appendix. For a convenient use of the text, I would have preferred more information in the apparatus proper. There is some confusion in the extensive bibliography on the *Bacchae* – C. Segal's article in *CW* 72, 1978, is not "Dionysus on the Couch and on the Grid" but "Pentheus and Hippolytus on the Couch. . .".

Maarit Kaimio

Hans Oranje: Euripides' Bacchae. The Play and its Audience. *Mnemosyne*, suppl. 78. E.J. Brill, Leiden 1984. VII, 200 p. Hfl. 64.-.

Euripides' *Bacchae* is one of the Greek tragedies which seem to be most alive in our time. There is a continual flow of diverging, even contradictory interpretations. Euripides has here touched some of the most basic and disquieting elements in human nature – sexuality, violence, experience of religious mysticism – and explores the frontiers of reason, irrationality and madness.

The method of the author of this book is to trace the audience response of Euripides' own day by analysing the action of the drama and the experience of the public as the drama unfolds itself; this way, he tries to elucidate Euripides' intentions with this drama, mainly his relation to the god Dionysus. It is, of course, very difficult to grasp the response of the original audience, but the way to analyse the plays on the basis of the fifth-century performance is surely a healthy and rewarding one. This holds especially true of the *Bacchae*, which has so often been handled from the viewpoints of modern thought (which can naturally also be a rewarding and revealing way to look at it), especially of psychology (e.g. E.R. Dodds, who in his commentary, ²1960, sees Pentheus as "the dark puritan whose passion is compounded of horror and unconscious desire", p. 172 to lines 222–223) or of psychoanalysis (e.g. C. Segal, 'Pentheus and Hippolytus on the couch and on the grid: psychoanalytic and structuralist reading of Greek tragedy', *CW* 72 [1978–79] 129–148; not mentioned by the author).

The author discusses (pp. 23–28) Bernard Beckerman's four aspects of the response of a spectator to the action of the play: the descriptive, the participational, the referential and the conceptual (*Dynamics of Drama. Theory and method of analysis*, New York 1970). This theory forms the frame of his analysis, although he admits that he is not keeping too strictly to it and that Beckerman's definitions of these aspects are in any case somewhat vague (p. 24). Especially in the question of such a drama as the *Bacchae*, the boundaries of these aspects seem very artificial. For instance, one cannot really analyse the participational aspect of the audience response – that is, the emotional involvement on the part of the spectator – without taking into account the referential aspect, in this

case mainly the experience of the audience of the Dionysiac cult; nor can the conceptual aspect – the ideas which the poet wishes to share with his public – be clearly distinguished from the referential aspect. The author is well aware of this, and in fact, Beckerman's distinction of aspects is in this book more like a grid laid upon the analysis from the outside than a real basis for the analysis.

There is, moreover, one important factor which is not brought out in the exposition of Beckerman's theory, but still plays a part in Oranje's analysis – the force of literary tradition and convention. This could be placed under the referential aspect, too. The author takes this factor well into account in his discussion of Dionysus (especially in chapters VII: The god on the tragic stage and VIII: The god's epiphanies in the *Bacchae*; I refer especially to the able analysis of the epiphanic elements in this play), but sometimes, in chapters IV and V discussing Pentheus, a sharper look at the conventions of tragic drama could produce different emphases in the interpretation. For example, passage 453–459, where Pentheus comments upon the beautiful appearance of the Stranger, which has been one of the key passages for the psychological interpretation, revealing Pentheus' suppressed desire. This is interpreted by the author simply as a confirmation that the description of the Stranger which Pentheus had heard (235–6) appears to have been correct; moreover, the author sees Pentheus' words as a friendly compliment to the Stranger, who is now safely in his hands (p. 52f.). But we should note that although dramatic persons sometimes remark on some feature of the outward appearance of their interlocutors – the most emphatic reactions which now come to my mind are those of Pelasgus when seeing the Danaids for the first time (*Aesch. Suppl.* 234–242) and of Orestes commenting on the circumstances of Electra in the *stichomythia* *Soph. El.* 1177ff. – the length of the description and the references to the erotic appeal of the Stranger (454, 456, 459) give to this passage a tone which is out of the ordinary in the light of the conventions of drama – what Euripides wishes to say with this extraordinary greeting is another problem.

Another passage, where the conventions of drama could be considered, is 642–659, where Pentheus confronts Dionysus after the palace miracles. The effect – i.e. the lack of effect – of the palace miracles on Pentheus has been, as the author says, one of the greatest problems in the *Bacchae* (p. 66). Why does Pentheus not react to the miracles, although even Dionysus himself anticipates a reaction in 639: "Whatever will he say after all this?" But does he – and the audience – really wait for an answer to this question? Isn't this as much as saying "he shall surely have nothing to say after all this" – as in fact is the case? The palace miracles have already been described twice (cf. p. 65) – first in the *amoibaion* with the chorus, then by Dionysus himself, who gives an eye-witness description, a variation of messenger speech. This is a conventional sequence, cf. murder scenes in tragedy. Do we need after this a third confirmation of the events by Pentheus? Must Pentheus' silence on the miracles be regarded as a denial of experiencing anything divine, as the author sees it (p. 67f.)? Is it not very effective that Pentheus, after (as Dionysus has described the event) fighting in vain against a phantasm in the palace, breaks out in desperate anger after losing his prey – whether he is exhausted or not, as Dionysus has said (634), we cannot know (cf. p. 67), but in any case he comes with a resounding step

(638), that is, not in a composed state of mind – and that, after seeing the Stranger again before his very eyes, he has no other thought in his head than to question how this could be possible? He can think of nothing else than putting his victim behind walls again. More than being a denial of anything supernatural in the Stranger, this futile attempt to use brute force in face of obvious defeat suggests the beginning of a collapse, which Dionysus is very soon to make complete. In this short scene, Dionysus has complete command of the situation, while Pentheus is shown to have lost his. Thus, I think the god is very far from suffering his greatest defeat on the Athenian stage (cf. p. 77).

So, it is obvious that there is no end to the possibilities of interpreting the *Bacchae*. The present book does give a new view of the problems of the play, which is worth considering seriously, even if I don't believe it will be the last word in the debate.

Maarit Kaimio

Euripides Cyclops. Edidit *Werner Biehl*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1983. XX, 60 S. M 24,50.

Mit dieser Edition liegt ein Weiterer Band der Euripides-Reihe beim Teubner-Verlag in Leipzig vor. Wie der Herausgeber, der sich auch früher schon um Euripides verdient gemacht hat, in seiner Praefatio gleich zu verstehen gibt, sind in seiner Ausgabe keine aufsehenerregenden Neuentdeckungen zu erwarten, weil der Text des euripideischen *Cyclops* allein in den letzten hundert Jahren durch nicht weniger als 14 kritische Herausgeberhände gegangen ist. So ist denn das Hauptanliegen der hier vorgelegten weiteren Edition vor allem darin zu sehen, das vorhandene Material in leicht zugänglicher und gut übersichtlicher Form dem Leser zugänglich zu machen.

Im ersten Kapitel seiner Praefatio weist der Herausgeber auf einige sprachliche Besonderheiten hin, die die Sprache des Satyrspiels von derjenigen der Tragödie unterscheidet; es werden hier 12 spezifische Fälle aufgeführt und mit Textbeispielen belegt. Dabei handelt es sich um leichte Abweichungen von den Regeln der formalen Grammatik – zum Teil sicher bedingt durch die beabsichtigte Situationskomik des Satyrspiels – und um stilistische Besonderheiten, die ebenfalls im Charakter der Satyrscene ihre Ursache haben mögen. Im ganzen sind die hier genannten Fälle dazu angetan, gar zu einer umfangreicheren Untersuchung zu diesem speziellen Thema sprachlicher Besonderheiten und einer situationsbedingten Abweichung von der sprachlichen Norm anzuregen.

Bei der Beurteilung der beiden Handschriften (L = cod. Laurent. 32,2 und P = cod. Palat. Vatic. 287) schließt sich der Herausgeber im wesentlichen den Ergebnissen an, zu denen G. Zuntz (*An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*, Cambridge 1965) gekommen ist, diskutiert aber einige Textstellen mit entsprechenden Varianten aus seiner eigenen Sicht, vor allem die unterschiedlichen Lesarten des Verses 207, denen Zuntz keine Beachtung geschenkt hat. Im darauffolgenden Abschnitt "Studiorum Conspectus" werden zunächst alle bisherigen Editionen des *Cyclops* aufgelistet und